

Mr. SPEAKER.—I suppose I can take it up because I find one or two other persons have also given notices. There are other members also who have given notice even a little earlier. I am trying to reconcile and see that there is no confusion.

Mr. Sivappa has given notice of this motion :

“ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡವದ್ದು ವಿಶ್ವಾಸವಿಲ್ಲ.”

May I know how many rise in support of it ?

(Counting was taken)

More than 30 have stood in support of it. The Motion is admitted. Under the rules, I am bound to fix the time for discussion either the next day or within the next three days consistent with the other work. I will try to deal with it at appropriate time.

Leave to move the motion was granted.

Member's Representation

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Harihara).—Sir, we read in papers that the Leader of the House is proceeding to Delhi. In order to facilitate any useful debate and discussion on this subject, I would request you to take it up when the Leader of the House is in Bangalore and when he is attending the session.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO Sri V. NAGAPPA—GRANT OF

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is one announcement. “I have received from Sri V. Nagappa, Member, Mysore Legislative Assembly, requesting for leave of absence from attending the current sittings of the Assembly. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly that permission be granted to Sri V. Nagappa for being absent from attending the current sittings of the Assembly ?

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Permission to remain absent is granted.

STATEMENT OF THE CHIEF MINISTER ON THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE MAHARASHTRA-MYSORE-KERALA BOUNDARIES DISPUTES.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—As I am immediately proceeding to Delhi, I want to intervene in the debate on the boundary question if I am permitted to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

† Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—This is a question which has been agitating the entire country and there is a lot of diverse opinion expressed in this behalf. As one, who knows intimately the development of this question during these years, I will confine myself to this report by Mr. Mahajan. The question of fixing up the boundaries have been, after the Parliament accepted the boundaries of the new States under the States Re-organisation Act, taken up by the people of Maharashtra and they have kept on agitating that certain parts in certain Taluks which are in Mysore State should be transferred to Maharashtra due to the fact, according to them, that the percentage of people speaking Marathi is in majority. The Government has submitted that this cannot be done since the Parliament has already given a decision accepting the States boundaries and the State is prepared for small adjustments within 10 miles belt from the boundary line. Meanwhile people in Kerala belonging to Kasargod area have also been agitating for being included in Mysore State. These matters are being agitated by the parties concerned. Since the Maharastrians' agitation was very great, this matter was taken up again and again not only in the press, but also in the Legislatures concerned and in the Working Committee of the Congress party. After a good deal of agitation from Maharastrians, the matter was taken up and it was decided in the Working Committee that a Commission may be appointed who may, on hearing all the parties concerned, namely, the Maharashtra, Mysore and Kerala give a final opinion in the matter. In fact at that time there was a feeling that there should be more than one member on the Commission. It was agreed with a view to see that this matter is finalised once for all, that there may be only one member on the Commission and at all ends without question, it was agreed that Sri Mahajan should be the person appointed and there was an allround universal acceptance of his appointment as the sole Commission. May I bring to the notice of this House that inspite of the protest from Mysore and inspite of my own protest that this should not be done, it was done to settle the disputes finally between these States i.e., Mysore-Maharashtra and Mysore-Kerala. I have agreed for this because there was a welcome for this Commission in Maharashtra. In Mysore there was a protest against it and a lot of activities like stopping of trains and buses went on. Inspite of that we accepted it with a view to give a finality to the entire matter once for all; and we gave the fullest co-operation to this Commission. The Mysore Government appointed a Committee with one of the very respected retired justices of the Mysore High Court as Chairman. I must take this opportunity to compliment that Committee and the Chairman that they have prepared a first class case so far as the demands of Mysore are concerned. Similarly, I must also compliment the Maharashtra Government that their case also was prepared in a first class manner and everything that has to be said was said by them. Certain allegations were made by the Maharashtra Government that they did not prepare the case properly. Both of us put a first class case

before the Commission. Sri Mahajan is one of the most respected citizens of India and a retired Chief Justice of the Supreme Court who has been respected all over the country for his impartiality, sobriety and tolerance. He went round the entire country. Wherever this question was, he examined the people not only in a formal manner but even in an informal manner. He studied the subject from all points of view. He has given his attention to what has been said before him, the documents that were produced before him not only regarding Maharashtra and Mysore but also regarding Kerala and Mysore, and he has given his verdict. It is unfortunate that the Kerala Government did not co-operate. When this Commission was appointed, there was no people's Government in Kerala. Subsequently, it came into existence after the recent elections. They ought to have co-operated, but they did not. It is not my purpose to find fault with that. But there is sufficient evidence to show that the area in Kasargod Taluk above Chandragiri River does not belong to them either by tradition or by culture or by history or accepted opinions of all parties including the communist party. The leaders have expressed themselves supporting the view as I have expressed. So, Sri Mahajan has given his verdict of course technically.

SRI P. B. NANDIHALI (Uchagaon).—I am very happy to listen to the explanation which is wanted by this House from the Hon'ble Leader of the Hon'ble House. Before that, I want a clear explanation from him. I read in the Newspaper i.e. Deccan Herald on 17th that Chief Minister has reiterated that Border report is an award. But according to my knowledge when a decision was taken on 25th October 1966, the Government of India resolved as follows—

“Taking into consideration the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of States in India and with a view to solving the existing border disputes between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore and Mysore-Kerala, the Government of India hereby appoint a Commission consisting of Shri Mehr Chand Mahajan, former Chief Justice of India, which shall hear the concerned parties and make its recommendations.”

SRI S. NIJALINGAPPA.—I am dealing with the same subject. Sir, he has given his report. According to me, considering the circumstances under which the Commission was appointed and considering the fact that only one member was appointed on the Commission because of his capacity to deal with it finally, I am still of the view, it is my personal opinion and I am sure this House will agree with it, that it should be treated as an award and therefore, I have called it an award. There is a possibility of considering that as only recommendation and as such it need not be treated as an award. Therefore, my friend if he understands me, will not behave like this.

(Interruption from a Member)

(SRI S. NIJALINGAPPA)

I am sorry for him. But there is a possibility of the entire report being considered only as a recommendation. It is possible to do so. But as I submitted, it ought to be treated as an award considering the circumstances. Otherwise, there will not be any finality to these things. After all, this is a matter which concerns two States, and I do not know why so much importance is attached to this. No area is getting out of India and it is in the fitness of things that we accept it as an award.

While saying so, I cannot say that the entire report is in our favour. We have lost very valuable area, very rich forests and we lose to the tune of crores. It is possibly the second biggest tobacco centre next to Guntur that we have to lose. But even so, even before the Report was published, many months before, I had said considering that Mr. Mahajan is the person appointed as one-man commission, I would unhesitatingly accept it as an award and I am prepared to abide by it. In view of the fact that there is necessity to finally settle this question, I said so. Now the award has come. I am amazed at the amount of agitation that has gone on in certain quarters. I do not like it. There is a limit to which we can go, regarding this. It is according to me not a major problem. We have to meet many major problems and more grave than this. I may take the House into confidence and say that a very important Maharashtrian came to me and said: 'why not divide Belgaum, you take half and we take half'.

SRI P. B. NANDIHALI.—May I know his name?

SRI S. NIJALINGAPPA.—It is in your interest that I should not disclose the name. If it becomes necessary, I will certainly do it. There was a suggestion like that. A city is a co-ordinated development and it cannot be just treated as a lifeless object. A city is a living, throbbing institution. It cannot be treated like that. It is something like trying to divide a man. I have told humourously: we also claim Sholapur: shall we divide Sholapur and take one part of it? There was no reply to that. Therefore, what I say is, the report is an award according to me. It does not fully support our case, because quite a large area which we thought would be given to us, and we earnestly desired, has not been given to us. But still, we accept it and that is because it is a decision from a high authority.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The reason for it is given in page 25, para 4 and 11. There he says, you could not succeed because of your lapses. That is what Mr. Mahajan says. You claimed statusquo and nothing more.

SRI S. NIJALINGAPPA.—That was the wisest decision to take immediately after the SRC. Nobody took exception to our stand. Our stand was correct. People thought that he handled our case very successfully because we have never made a wrong claim. It is a credit... ..

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The Commission says subsequently, you have changed your mind and subsequently you have claimed. He says: 'consistency however is a virtue that cannot be insisted in politics'.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—What we said was correct at the time of the SRC. Our claim has never been unjust. When the matter came up before the Commission like this, we said we have claimed these things, these are our reasons, you please give your verdict. If we had not said that, we would have been inconsistent, because it required that we should put the entire case. We have what we said in 1956. Otherwise, we would have lost the whole case, in Maharashtra, Kerala and in Madras and Andhra. Therefore, we have put the whole of our case on that basis. When claims were made by other people we said that after all there is a decision made by Parliament and we accept it. The same idea, the same policy applies even to this day, so far as we are concerned. We say that it has been considered by an impartial judge who is accepted in the country as one of the best judicial men we can come across. Therefore, we have to accept it. Any case may be argued. I can argue that a certain village should be in Mysore or Maharashtra. After all there must be an end. It is therefore that I say, wisdom lies and patriotism lies in the fact that people should not start unnecessary agitation and that this report must be accepted in toto. It may be that we suffer a little. It may be that Maharashtra may suffer a little, it may be that Kerala may suffer a little. I do not know whether Kerala suffers at all. Time has come when this House will have to make up its mind and say with one voice that we accept the entire report in toto and urge upon the Central Government that they may take a decision in this behalf, and that the entire House stands for accepting the report in full.

Thank you Sir.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Sir, on behalf of Sri Veerendra Patil, Minister for Public Works and Electricity I beg to lay on the Table, the Mysore Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Rates) (Amendment) Rules, 1967 issued in Notification No. PWD 10 LBW 67, dated 3rd August 1967 under section 11 (4) of the Mysore Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution and Water Rate) Act, 1957, (Mysore Act No. 28 of 1957).

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Notification is laid on the Table.

Business of the House

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are a number of rulings to be given. I have got them.